THE LADDER 50¢

March

purpose of the

Daughters of BILITIS

A WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROMOTING THE INTEGRATION OF THE HOMOSEXUAL INTO SOCIETY BY:

1. Education of the variant, with particular emphasis on the psychological, physiological and sociological aspects, to enable her to understand herself and make her adjustment to society in all its social, civic and economic implications—this to be accomplished by establishing and maintaining as complete a library as possible of both fiction and non-fiction literature on the sex deviant theme; by sponsoring public discussions on pertinent subjects to be conducted by leading members of the legal, psychiatric, religious and other professions; by advocating a mode of behavior and dress acceptable to society.

2. Education of the public at large through acceptance first of the individual, leading to an eventual breakdown of erroneous taboos and prejudices; through public discussion meetings aforementioned; through dissemination of educational literature on the homosexual theme.

3. Participation in research projects by duly authorized and responsible psychologists, sociologists and other such experts directed towards further knowledge of the homosexual.

4. Investigation of the penal code as it pertains to the homosexual, proposal of changes to provide an equitable handling of cases involving this minority group, and promotion of these changes through due process of law in the state legislatures.

the Ladder

MARCH 1961
VOLUME 5, NUMBER 6

Published monthly by the Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., a non-profit corporation, 1232 Market Street, Suite 108, San Francisco 2, California. Telephone: UNderhill 3 - 8196.

NATIONAL OFFICERS, DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC.

President — Jaye Bell
Vice President — Helen Sanders
Recording Secretary — Dottie Dee
Corresponding Secretary — Chris Hayden
Public Relations Director — Jo Carson
Treasurer — Ev Howe

THE LADDER STAFF

Editor — Del Martin
Editorial Assistants — Agatha Mathys, Elaine Kingston, Millie Jensen, Jean Nathan
Los Angeles Reporter — Sten Russell
Production Manager — Patty Patterson
Circulation Manager — Cleo Glenn

THE LADDER is regarded as a sounding board for various points of view on the homophile and related subjects and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the organization.

contents

WE'VE MOVED!..... 4
DOB ANNOUNCES BLANCHE M. BAKER SCHOLARSHIP..... 5
FEAR OR LACK OF TRUST? - EDITORIAL..... 6
HOMOSEXUAL BILL OF RIGHTS SIZZLES & FIZZLES..... 8
SPECIAL NOTICES FROM DOB BOOK SERVICE.....26

COVER BY BILLIE THIS MONTH IS A SKETCH OF ARTEMIS SMITH, AUTHOR OF THE THIRD SEX AND ODD GIRL, WHOSE BOOKS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE DOB BOOK SERVICE (SEE BACK COVER).

WE'VE MOVED !!

WE HAVE A NEW HOME!

AS YOU KNOW, SAN FRANCISCO IS WORLD FAMOUS. AND MARKET STREET IN SAN FRANCISCO IS KNOWN FROM THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE TO PISMO BEACH. WE HAVE BEEN PLAGUED BY OUR FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS IN NEW DELHI AND PARIS SUBTLEY MENTIONING AND BLUNTLY POINTING OUT THAT IT WOULD BE VERY CHIC TO HAVE A MARKET STREET ADDRESS.

AFTER A GREAT DEAL OF CONFERENCING AND COIN-FLIPPING THE BOARD TOOK THE MATTER UNDER SERIOUS CONSIDERATION - AND WE DO HAVE A NEW HOME: SUITE 108, 1232 MARKET STREET, SAN FRANCISCO 2. WE EVEN HAVE A NEW PHONE NUMBER: UNDERHILL (NOT SUBVERSIVE, REALLY) 3-8196.

TRADITION AND PRECEDENCE BEING WHAT THEY ARE WE SHAN'T CHANGE OUR WAYS. THE NATIONAL OFFICE WILL STILL BE OPEN ON TUESDAY AND THURSDAY EVENINGS (AS WELL AS VARIOUS OTHER TIMES WHEN THE COMERADESHIP OF AN UNFINISHED TASK OR DIRTY WORK-PROJECT BRINGS PEOPLE TOGETHER).

AND BE REASSURED ALL YOU WHO ARE WONDERING WHERE TO SEND YOUR FOUR BUCKS TO RENEW YOUR LADDER SUBSCRIPTION. WE ARE RIGHT HERE ON MARKET STREET TOO. AND, FOR THOSE LITERATE MEMBERS, DITTO FOR THE DOB BOOK SERVICE AND THE SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER LIBRARY.

LOS ANGELES TOO!

NOW IF YOU HAPPEN TO BE DOWN LOS ANGELES WAY AND FEEL THIS MIGHT BE A BIT TOO FAR TO COME, YOU MIGHT TRY THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE LOS ANGELES CHAPTER (YES, THEY HAVE A NEW HOME TOO!) AT 527 HAZEL STREET (NOW WOULDN'T YOU KNOW IT WOULD BE HAZEL STREET AND NOT RICHARD ROAD) IN GLENDALE.

* * * * *

A READER QUERIED IN THE FEBRUARY ISSUE THE ANTECEDENTS OF "IN THE TWILIGHT", A TRANSLATION BY ABIGAIL SANFORD OF A STORY BY MARCEL PROUST WHICH APPEARED IN THE DECEMBER LADDER. THIS WAS THE FIRST TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH OF THE STORY WHICH PROUST PUBLISHED IN 1893. IT IS NOT WELL KNOWN IN FRANCE, AND IS INDEED HIGHLY SYMPATHETIC. ONE OR TWO OF PROUST'S BIOGRAPHERS REFER TO ITS VERY OUTSPOKEN DEFENSE COMPARED TO HIS LATER WORK.

D.O.B. Proudly Announces
BLANCHE M. BAKER
MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP FUND

YOU READ IN THE JANUARY LADDER OF THE PASSING OF "DOC" BAKER AND THE LOSS WE SO KEENLY FEEL OF BOTH A FRIEND AND A MOVING FORCE IN EDUCATING THE PUBLIC AND THE HOMOSEXUAL TOWARDS A GREATER UNDERSTANDING AND ACCEPTANCE OF OUR PLACE IN SOCIETY. THE GREAT NEED FOR THE TYPE OF WORK SHE GAVE SO MUCH TIME TO IS SOMETHING OF WHICH WE ARE ALL ACUTELY AWARE. REPLACE HER WE CAN NEVER DO. BUT WE FEEL THERE IS A MEANS BY WHICH WE CAN PAY TANGIBLE TRIBUTE TO HER MEMORY AND AID IN CARRYING ON OF HER WORK.

THE BLANCHE M. BAKER MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP FUND HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THE DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS. SOME CONTRIBUTIONS HAVE ALREADY BEEN MADE, PROVIDING A TANGIBLE BASE RATHER THAN JUST A "NICE-THOUGHT-BUT-NEVER-GOT-REALIZED" PROJECT.

THE IDEA FOR A SCHOLARSHIP FUND WAS FIRST BROUGHT UP AT DOB'S FIRST CONVENTION IN WAY OF 1960 BY A MEMBER OF THE NEW YORK CHAPTER, AND OKAYED BY THE MEMBERSHIP. THE IDEA OF A FUND HONORING DR. BAKER HAS GIVEN IMPETUS TO THE IDEA.

THE DETAILS HAVE YET TO BE WORKED OUT. AT PRESENT PLANS ARE THAT IT WILL BE AWARDED TO WOMEN OVER 21. THE SUGGESTION HAS BEEN MADE THAT THE SCHOLARSHIP BE LIMITED TO PERSONS STUDYING IN LAW, PSYCHOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY OR A RELATED FIELD. IF YOU HAVE ANY IDEAS ON DEFINING OR NOT DEFINING THE AREA OF STUDY, ON WHAT LEVEL OF EDUCATION (GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE) IT SHOULD BE AWARDED, WHETHER IT SHOULD BE A LOAN FUND (REPAYABLE) OR A STRAIGHT GRANT, OR ANY OTHERS WHICH WOULD BE PERTINENT, SEND THEM WITH YOUR CONTRIBUTION SO THAT YOUR VOICE CAN PLAY A PART IN DETERMINING THE REQUIREMENTS.

THE FIRST BLANCHE M. BKAER MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP WILL PROBABLY BE AWARDED AT THE SECOND NATIONAL CONVENTION OF DOB IN 1962.

P.S. MAKE YOUR CHECK PAYABLE TO THE DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, AND INDICATE ON THE CHECK, "SCHOLARSHIP FUND".

EDITORIAL

Fear or Lack of Trust?

TWO POINTS BROUGHT OUT BY DR. EVELYN HOOKER AT ONE'S MIDWINTER INSTITUTE BANQUET COULD WELL BE ELABORATED UPON. THE QUESTION WAS POSED AS TO WHY SO FEW PEOPLE ATTENDED THE INSTITUTE THIS YEAR - WAS IT FEAR ON THE PART OF THE HOMOSEXUAL TO DISCUSS HIS "RIGHTS"? ALSO DR. HOOKER EXPLAINED AT SOME LENGTH THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE RESEARCHER TO HIS SUBJECTS AND THE TRUST WHICH MUST BE MAINTAINED BETWEEN THE TWO. IT WOULD SEEM TO US THAT PERHAPS THERE IS A PARALLEL BETWEEN THESE TWO POINTS - FEAR AND TRUST - IN THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE.

REACTION AGAINST ONE'S PROPOSED "HOMOSEXUAL BILL OF RIGHTS" ON THE PART OF DOB MEMBERS AND READERS OF THE LADDER WAS APPARENT FROM THE FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT. FEAR WAS NOT THEIR PRIME CONCERN THEN. THEY HONESTLY COULD NOT SEE THE POINT OF A "HOMOSEXUAL BILL OF RIGHTS" AND FELT THAT THEY COULD BETTER EXPEND THEIR EFFORTS TOWARDS THE PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FOR ALL CITIZENS.

HOWEVER, IT MUST BE ADMITTED THAT SOME OF THE ALARM COULD VERY WELL BE ATTRIBUTED TO FEAR - FEAR THAT THE MILITANT EXTREME WOULD SET HOMOSEXUALS FURTHER APART FROM SOCIETY, FEAR OF ADVERSE PUBLICITY AND ITS HARMFUL EFFECT UPON THE HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT, AND FEAR OF OPEN IDENTIFICATION IN PUBLIC.

PAST CONVENTIONS HELD BY THE THREE ORGANIZATIONS (DOB, MATTACHINE SOCIETY AND ONE) HAVE BEEN DESIGNED TO DISCUSS THE PROS AND CONS OF THE SUBJECT FROM VARIOUS POINTS OF VIEW, ENABLING ANYONE WHO MIGHT BE AT ALL INTERESTED IN THE SUBJECT, FOR WHATEVER REASON, TO ATTEND. THESE MEETINGS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AND HAVE DONE MUCH FOR "PUBLIC RELATIONS" FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS. THE ONE MEETING BY ITS VERY TITLE WAS A CLOSED AND LIMITED SESSION FOR THOSE WHO WISHED TO ASSUME AND PUSH THE LABEL WHICH MANY FEEL CATEGORIZES ONLY A PART OF THE WHOLE BEING.

THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS TO BE CONSIDERED - INDIFFERENCE, LACK OF INTEREST IN A "HOMOSEXUAL BILL OF RIGHTS", FEAR AND LACK OF TRUST. HOW WAS THE DRAWING UP OF THE "BILL" TO BE CONDUCTED AND TO WHAT PURPOSE WOULD IT BE USED?

IT IS AN INCONTROVERTIBLE FACT THAT WHATEVER ONE HOMOPHILE ORGANIZATION MAY SAY OR DO HAS AN EFFECT ON THE OTHER ORGANIZATIONS WORKING IN THE FIELD, AND UPON THE HOMOSEXUAL MINORITY AS A WHOLE. TO THE PRESS AND TO THE PUBLIC AT LARGE THEY ARE ONE AND THE SAME - THOUGH THEY REPRESENT DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW. IT IS ALSO ASSUMED THAT THESE ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENT THE HOMOSEXUAL AT LARGE, THOUGH THEY ARE ACTUALLY A MINORITY WITHIN A MINORITY.

BECAUSE OF THESE ASSUMPTIONS THE ORGANIZATIONS MUST BECOME AWARE OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS TO EACH OTHER AND TO THE MINORITY GROUP THEY REPRESENT. THEY MUST BE AWARE OF THE REPERCUSSIONS OF THEIR WORDS AND DEEDS UPON OTHERS. AND THIS APPLIES AS WELL TO OUR FRIENDS IN PROFESSIONAL CIRCLES. IF WE TAKE ACTION WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED OFF BEAT, WE ARE CERTAINLY PLACING THEM IN AN AWKWARD POSITION, TO SAY THE LEAST. HOW CAN THEY BE EXPECTED TO WORK WITH THE ORGANIZATIONS IF THEY CANNOT TRUST US AND HAVE CONFIDENCE IN WHATEVER PROGRAMS WE MAY EMBARK UPON? IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT ONE HAD PLANNED TO HAVE PROFESSIONAL PERSONS REPRESENTING THE VARIOUS FIELDS COVERED BY THE INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS GIVE THEIR COMMENTS ON THE PANEL AT THE BANQUET. ONLY TWO SUCH PEOPLE, DR. HOOKER AND AN ATTORNEY, DID SO. THE OTHERS BEGGED OFF. WHY?

THE "HOMOSEXUAL BILL OF RIGHTS" CONTROVERSY CAN YET PROVE TO BE A CONSTRUCTIVE AND HEALTHY THING. THE HEAT OF DEBATE CLARIFIED THE THINKING OF A GREAT MANY INDIVIDUALS PRESENT. THEY HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A HOMOSEXUAL AND WHAT EFFECT THE HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT HAS HAD TO DATE. WE WOULD SUGGEST A FURTHER CONFERENCE BETWEEN LEADERS OF THE THREE ORGANIZATIONS TO PRESENT EACH ONE'S PURPOSES AND PHILOSOPHY AND TO DISCUSS THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO EACH OTHER, THEIR FRIENDS AND THE PUBLIC. PERHAPS THROUGH SUCH A MEETING A NEW FAITH IN THE HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT AND WHERE IT IS HEADED COULD BE ESTABLISHED. FOR FAITH AND TRUST MUST BE REPLENISHED. THAT WE ARE WORTHY OF TRUST MUST BE PROVED CONSTANTLY.

- DEL MARTIN

Homosexual Bill of Rights Sizzles and Fizzles

ONE's Midwinter Institute this year was indeed a revolutionary change of format. There has been no other homophile convention like it - a "gab 'n Java"-type conference with words flowing at a rapid pace for two days.

The program read "A Homosexual Bill of Rights, Landmark in Man's Freedom - or Insanity? Which Is It?" We will let the reader draw his own conclusions from the following report of the proceedings.

The Institute opened with an address of welcome by Sten Russell, associate editor of ONE Magazine. She explained that ONE's Seventh Midwinter Institute was to be a "group project in homophile education." She said that the weekend sessions together with the 325 or more questionnaires from all over the world, which were yet to be tabulated, represented an "attempt to clarify the thinking of a large group of homophiles."

"I commend you for your courage in coming," Miss Russell declared. She added that the program was not rigged, that those attending would actually be making up the program.

After Miss Russell's welcome those assembled (an estimated 40 people) broke up into five drafting committees - (1) Preamble and Definitions; (2) Social Rights; (3) Religious Rights; (4) Scientific Questions and Overpopulation, and (5) Legal Rights. It is impossible of course to give a complete account of the deliberations of each group. We are presenting here the "duties and suggested topics for drafting committees" as outlined in ONE's program, followed by some discussion and the conclusion drawn up by each committee.

COMMITTEE I. PREAMBLE AND DEFINITIONS.

A. To supply, on request from other Drafting Committees,

"official definitions" of terms as they are to be understood for use in the Bill of Rights;

B. To establish a working definition, for purposes of the Bill, of the groups or classes of persons to whom the Bill shall be said to refer;

C. To prepare a Preamble to the Bill;

D. Suggested topics for consideration:

1. The right of non-conformity; the right of choice (free will); the line between individual and group rights;

2. Do homosexuals have the right to demand the status of a minority group? Must the wishes of the majority be accepted? The right to civil disobedience;

3. Can democratic voting procedures determine moral and ethical questions? Does the State have authority to prescribe sexual behavior? Do homosexuals have the right to set up their own standards of sex behavior - as individuals, as a group?

COMMITTEE DELIBERATIONS.

This committee started out with five men and three women who struggled for the most part the first day over definitions. They agreed that "rights" can mean all things to all people. For purposes of the "Bill" the following definitions were adopted:

Right - that to which one has a just claim.
Legal right - privilege vested in a person by the law.
Moral right - expectation that duties of honorable behavior be reciprocal.

In discussing the outlined topics they expressed belief that everyone now has a right to non-conformity up to the point of exercising or display of proscribed sexual proclivities either public or private. Certainly there is the right to choose, though exercising that right may be dangerous and could lead to social, economic and legal consequen-

ces. This factor has made the moral freedom of honesty impossible for the homosexual. There was expressed also the need of the homosexual to regain his pride as a human being.

As to the uses of the "bill", these were varied and never agreed upon: To be published in "ONE Quarterly of Homophile Studies"; educational guide for the homosexual and the public; as start for continuing study with drafts to other homophile groups all over the world for further comment; for distribution to the public, newspapers, educational and political leaders.

The formulation of the preamble itself became a free-for-all during the final Sunday session. The three women withdrew from participation on the grounds that they did not believe in a "Homosexual Bill of Rights" and therefore could not help to formulate one. Others from other groups which had finished their work did join the preamble committee to draw up the following statement.

CONCLUSION (PREAMBLE)

We who represent the homosexual minority which must be recognized as a valid and necessary part of society, undeniably existing within our total culture, hereby declare that the human individuals expressing basic differences are entitled to the right to pursue their emotional and sexual happiness freely and equally within reasonable and responsible limits; the natural right to live unconventionally in peace with mankind and the right to press for changes in religious, social, and legal codes and attitudes to make this possible; all of this to be accomplished by established democratic procedures and from the findings of social and psychological sciences with high moral and ethical aspirations of homosexuals everywhere.

COMMITTEE II. SOCIAL RIGHTS

A. To prepare and present the section of the Bill dealing with social rights and responsibilities;

B. To give particular attention to problems concerning women;

C. Suggested topics for consideration:

1. Work rights - The right to employment without discrimination in either private or public capacity; the right to military service without prejudice or penalty.

2. Fiscal rights - The right to equal insurance privileges; to own and bequeath real or personal property on an equal footing with other portions of society; the right to inheritance; equal tax rights; to own and conduct businesses on equal footing with others.

3. Social rights - To choose one's mode of dress; to determine suitable public and private behavior; to participate freely in community affairs and public life; to social facilities and privileges (dancing, sports, etc.).

4. Family rights - The right to parental respect and understanding; the right to social equality with heterosexual brothers and sisters; the right to have children, if desired.

5. Personality rights - The right to be free from social discrimination; the right to be free from social contempt; freedom from slander.

6. Special rights, if any.

CONCLUSION

B. We could find no particular problems under this heading which would apply only to women.

1. There should be no discrimination because of sexual orientation per se. Instead, employment applications should concern themselves directly with evidence of stability, reliability, and character. This total evidence should be considered rather than the one fact of sexual orientation.

2. There should be a broadening of the concept of "household" in regard to income tax, which would be

beneficial to single persons with no dependents who live in joint tenancy.

3. We found no area where these rights are specifically denied.

4. People have the right to think. We cannot legislate or demand they think in a certain way. Such a demand would be the grossest violation of their human and democratic rights. We should recognize that attitudes are the result of culture, experience, and thinking. We should do what we can to educate people, but we cannot change their culture or their experience.

5. We do not consider it reasonable to assume that anyone's right to discriminate or hold in contempt be denied and therefore cannot see any way to consider these matters. Slander is a form of crime and we do have legal rights to seek recourse.

6. We do not believe in a "Homosexual" Bill of Rights. Any rights which uphold the dignity of mankind and permit him the benefits of a democratic society should apply to all persons regardless of sexual orientation, race, religion or status.

7. The "Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution" and those social rights which are custom in our communities are all the rights necessary for anyone in this nation, provided advantage is taken of these rights.

USE: We hope that the essence of this discussion can be written up and used in publications and communications as material for further research and education. We cannot recommend that our section be incorporated in an actual "Bill" or formal demand.

COMMITTEE III. RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

A. Duty of this committee is to prepare the section of the Bill dealing with the religious rights of homosexuals;

B. Suggested topics for consideration:

1. Doctrinal rights. The right to be theologically evaluated as are other members of society; the right to be as free from religious denunciation as anyone; the right to have homosexual love accorded no lower rank than heterosexual love.

2. Institutional rights. The right to take active part in church work; to hold church offices without prejudice; to equal treatment as a church member.

3. Rights of equity. The right to be free of religiously-imposed mask-wearing (hypocritical behavior); the right to equal treatment by both clergy and organizations, i.e., to official attitudes in conformity with actual practices.

4. The right to church-approved homosexual marriage for those who wish it.

5. The right to freedom from religious interference (for the non-religious).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The homosexual must tolerate organized religion in the literal sense of the word. Homosexual love should not be considered different from heterosexual love. The clergy should be the first to be informed of the true nature of the homosexual.

The homosexual should have the right to take part in church work to whatever extent he wishes without discrimination.

There need be no conflict between homosexuality and religion. The clergy can meet the homosexual on his own level - not force him to go to theirs and perhaps find rejection. In organized religion the label "homosexual" blots out the man and brings forth one aspect of him; therefore it should be dropped.

The committee was in agreement that there is no valid

justification for homosexual marriage, as the term is universally used.

COMMITTEE REPORT

All persons are equal before God. Basic human rights are not affected by any states or conditions. These rights correspond to universally-recognized obligations. We are not different in the things that matter. We ask to be recognized, i.e., that the part be reconciled to the whole. Homosexuality is one facet of the human estate. The church, because of its very nature (preaching the affirmation of life), ought to be giving the individual the ultimate unconditional security.

Conclusion: We affirm that homosexuals are human beings and as such are entitled to the same rights in religion as are all others.

COMMITTEE IV. SCIENTIFIC QUESTIONS AND OVERPOPULATION

A. To prepare the section of the Bill dealing with the rights homosexuals seek from the sciences (and social sciences);

B. To give particular attention to the rights of homosexuals in relation to the current world-wide population explosion;

C. Suggested topics for consideration:

1. The right to have scientific study of homosexuality freed of value-judgments; the right to have scholars study human behavior without censoring out homosexual factors; the right to free, frank, scientific reporting.

2. The right to have homosexuality studied objectively, i.e., without an ever-present heterosexual frame of reference; the right to have homosexuality presented as simply a mode of behavior, not a deviation, variation, perversion, inversion, etc.

3. The right to serious, scientific treatment of the role

of the homosexual concerning overpopulation; eugenics, artificial insemination.

4. The right to impartial sex education of young people concerning homosexuality; the right to require scientists to fearlessly seek out and present factual information on the topic to adolescents; the right to demand objectivity from social scientists and case workers concerning the topic.

5. The right to defense from faulty court testimony by psychologists, psychiatrists, etc.

DISCUSSION ON OVERPOPULATION

Besides a reading of all sample questionnaires and letters, a reading was given of "Birth Control is the Answer to our World's Mass Misery" by John Crosby, Mirror-News, L.A., 1-26-61, and also a reading of Ellis Radick's article "Homosexuality and Overpopulation", ONE Magazine, Sept., 1960. The arguments were vociferous on the matter and finally a question was formulated and voted upon: Do you believe that homosexuals should advocate "homosexuality" for heterosexually or bisexually oriented people on the grounds "that it may be considered a brake on overpopulation"? The result was 6 No's and one violent Yes. The following day, with 3 new male members and 2 absent male members, the question was re-voted, bring it to 7 No's and 2 violent Yes's. The results were the same for the second posed question: "Do you believe that anyone (not just homosexuals) should advocate the above-mentioned premise?" Again, 7 No's and 2 Yes's. Incidentally, the 7 No's were as firm as the 2 Yes's. They agreed that overpopulation was a number one world problem, but that it should never be used as an argument justifying homosexuality, nor homosexuality advocated for anyone on this basis. It was felt that homosexuality should be chosen freely by those who could find no happier adjustment to life - that homosexuality should be equated with free choice and dignity of the individual, never with coercion by the State or any group of people. It was agreed by all present that it could no longer be held by anyone that the homosexual was avoiding his duty to the State by

remaining unmarried and childless in the light of the world-wide population explosion. It was felt by the 7 that this was primarily a heterosexual concern and that any homosexuals particularly disturbed on the matter should work with organizations which espouse planned parenthood or seek to make cheap, effective birth-control methods available to all those concerned.

CONCLUSIONS

This report is presented with the following qualifications:

1. The committee, voting 7-2, does not accept the title "A Homosexual Bill of Rights" as a proper identification for the report they offer based on the instructions provided for the committee's activities.

2. The committee would prefer an alternate title to the proposed bill of rights to read: "A Report on Some Homosexual Attitudes as to their Rights and Needs".

A. In general, we do not believe that "rights" are involved with scientific theories and desire only to see scientists and social scientists live up to their own highest ideals of their professions. If any rights have been abrogated by scientific theories, the only one we can think of is the Right to Self-Acceptance and Personal Growth, which is hindered by the all-prevailing theory held that homosexuality is "per se" an indication of mental illness or emotional maladjustment.

B. Regarding the matter of homosexuality and overpopulation the committee voted 7-2 against the concept that homosexuality should be advocated for heterosexually or bisexually oriented people on the grounds that it could be considered a brake on overpopulation. They felt that society could no longer demand that the homosexual produce children as a duty, since there is a population explosion, but that otherwise the homosexual was not concerned with overpopulation, eugenics, or artificial insemination, except as an interested citizen. Contraceptives were considered as a means heterosexuals should investigate, but

mainly it was felt to be a heterosexual problem which they should solve.

C. It was voted by a majority that:

1. There is a need to have scientific study of homosexuality freed of value judgments; the need to have scholars study human behavior without censoring out homosexual factors; the right to free, frank, scientific reporting.

2. The need to have homosexuality studied objectively, i.e., without the ever-present heterosexual frame of reference; the need to have homosexuality presented as simply a mode of behavior, not a deviation, a variation, perversion, inversion, etc.

3. The need for impartial sex education of young people concerning homosexuality; the right to invite scientists to fearlessly seek out and present factual information on the topic to adolescents; the need for objectivity from case workers concerning the topic.

4. The right to defense from faulty court testimony by psychologists, psychiatrists, etc.

5. The need for supportive therapy, i.e., adjustment therapy for homosexuals to a homosexual role.

As to uses of the final document, it was felt that until the final document was drafted and the questionnaires tabulated, that no uses could be predicated.

An alternate view was that in any case it should be published as a report on a survey of a segment of homophile opinion on Rights and Needs.

COMMITTEE V. LEGAL RIGHTS

A. To prepare the section of the Bill dealing with the legal rights of homosexuals, and with homosexual behavior;

B. To give special attention to discriminatory judicial and law-enforcement attitudes toward homosexuals; the

right to freedom from felony (or misdemeanor) registration laws;

C. Suggested topics for consideration:

1. The right to equal treatment before the law; to be free from discriminatory statutes.

2. The right to relief from police provocation and "entrapment" methods; the right to domestic privacy.

3. Absolute freedom (equal treatment) concerning search and seizure procedures; freedom from police surveillance and wire-tapping.

4. The right of free association, in public or private, with individuals of one's own choosing.

5. Absolute separation of church and state, including abolition of every remnant of old ecclesiastical sex laws.

6. The right to full first-class citizenship, including voting rights, jury duty, holding public office.

7. The absolute right to complete personal privacy insofar as homosexuality is concerned, including complete destruction of every fingerprint, photo, or other record file obtained in connection with homosexual behavior of any individual; the right to sue for libel for newspaper publishing references to such items; for slander; for public utterances of like nature.

8. The right to full compensation and damages for any person discharged from public or private employment because of his homosexuality.

9. Complete civil rights as a practicing homosexual.

10. The right to custody of one's own children, or adoption.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The committee expressed the opinion that in general homo-

sexuals already have equal rights with the heterosexual. Though these rights are sometimes infringed upon by law enforcement agencies, the infringement was thought to be something that could not be changed until the basic attitudes of the agents themselves are changed.

The Declaration of Independence's guarantee of the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" was considered in relation to the homosexual. Members of the committee agreed that the homosexual should have only the same rights as any other person. The committee did not favor special privileges for homosexuals only. They were interested in seeing that the homosexual receives recognition as a useful and legitimate member of society, and that the laws are uniformly enforced. They felt that every person has the right to the pursuit of happiness in accordance with his own nature.

It was agreed that there must necessarily be some restrictions placed on the behavior of all persons, including the homosexual. It was felt that there must be some protections against persistent importuning, some protection for minors, and protection against the use of force or violence.

CONCLUSION

We believe that adult or sexually mature individuals should have, equally, all legal rights to live their lives as homosexual or heterosexual (however they are inclined), when the sex expression is with another adult or sexually mature person, provided it is with consent and without demonstrable harm or force, and provided it is conducted in private, and that all statutes to the contrary should be amended as necessary. From such a position the ground for many capricious prosecutions, persecutions, discriminations and intimidations by the law enforcement agencies would be removed.

PANEL COMMENTS

At the banquet on Sunday afternoon the reports of each of the committees was read. Following the reading a panel of four commentators was asked by W. Dorr Legg,

director of ONE Institute, to give their views of the proceedings.

First to speak was Del Martin, editor of THE LADDER and former national president of DOB. She began:

"I very seriously considered coming to this banquet in jeans and my DOB sweat shirt. It is after all my right, isn't it?" With this beginning, Miss Martin continued by reminding the group that in the January issue of THE LADDER she had written an editorial protesting the idea of drafting a "Homosexual Bill of Rights" on the grounds that such a bill is "unnecessary, irrelevant and likely to set the homophile movement back into oblivion". She added that her attitude had not changed.

She pointed out that ONE had especially invited DOB members to participate as "the loyal opposition", and that the DOB idea in coming was to try and change the format in order to find a framework in which all could work cooperatively. This was the plan, even though ONE had advised DOB that theirs was the minority opinion.

"You can imagine our complete and utter surprise", she declared, when after Saturday's luncheon we found that "others not only agreed with us but apparently comprised the majority opinion of those present. Things looked brighter for a moment - but only for a moment. Further discussion was ruled out and the assembly directed to follow the proposed program without change, regardless of the group's feelings."

Miss Martin reported that she had repeatedly tried to find out just what the group was trying to accomplish, and what ONE had conceived of while formulating the program. These attempts were fruitless, she said, adding that various members of ONE whom she had sought out during the two days had explained the "Bill" to her in "many different and contradictory ways - each of which would have necessitated a different approach in writing the proposed document."

"Now, you must admit that this does place one in a rather awkward position - to help to write a document in which

one has no faith and without any knowledge as to the uses to which it would be put.

"However, being a woman, I do want one last word. One of the interpretations I received from a member of ONE as to the purpose of these sessions was that which appeared in the program - 'A Group Participation Project in Homophile Education' - nothing more. I would suggest that rather it should be called 'A Group Participation Project in Contradiction, Confusion and Organized Deliberate Deception!. Talk about entrapment. We've been had!"

MATTACHINE IN THE MIDDLE

The second commentator was Hal Call, editor of "The Mattachine Review". He indicated that perhaps the positions of the three organizations had changed somewhat, with ONE at one end, DOB at the other and Mattachine in the middle as a balancing factor. He did incline towards the thought that the topic of the weekend's discussion was certainly a negative public relations topic, but added that even negatives have their positive side.

Call pointed out that semantics proved a great stumbling block. "The topics covered were awe-inspiring" and perhaps those present were afraid of tackling the problem. However, significant work was done, even though the group did not come up with a "Bill of Rights". "Do we have a right to ask for rights?" he inquired, and if so, should not we ask carefully and dispassionately, requesting no special license. Obviously the people present at ONE Institute had asked no special license.

"We need people of courage and good will to band together and ask for our rights," he said. We are even entitled to special pleading although we have not asked for it. All in all, he concluded, the topic was quite a "hot ball of fire".

Legg, before introducing the next commentator, asked if the group was afraid to think of itself as entitled to special pleading. He then introduced a prominent Los Angeles attorney, who had not attended any of the previous work sessions.

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR HOMOSEXUALS - ? OR !

The attorney inquired if the title of the Institute might not have been a "Bill of Rights for Homosexuals"ending with a question mark or an exclamation point. We do have a Bill of Rights, he said, but added that the homosexual is not given a fair shake in many instances. He pointed out ONE's victory in the U.S. Supreme Court as a victory under the Bill of Rights, since banning of information regarding homosexuality would be a violation of rights accruing under the Constitution. He added that other groups have had their rights violated too.

There is no law against homosexuality per se, and the American Law Institute has okayed the idea that consenting adults, where there is no force or violence, have a right to their own sexual preferences in private. He added that this point of view seems to be growing in popularity.

Education of all people seems to be the answer to the problem of the homosexual. In religion, for instance, only work of homosexuals within their own churches will really help to educate the congregations.

The attorney ended with the observation that a really good end towards which to work would be the application of the Bill of Rights and other documents of freedom to all people, regardless of whether they are homosexual or heterosexual.

RESEARCHER ASKS WHY?

Dr. Evelyn Hooker of UCLA, psychologist and researcher in the field of homosexuality for several years, attended the two-day meeting, listening in on the various groups as they were discussing their specific topic. In rising to speak as the last of the commentators, she questioned "why hold such a meeting", and why did so few attend this Institute in comparison to other meetings of homophile organizations? One interpretation of this is timidity or fearfulness of the homophile to discuss such rights. And she added that one of the stereotyped pictures

the heterosexual holds of the homosexual is that they are timid and fearful.

The homosexual is caught between two worlds and ambivalent about both, Dr. Hooker said, wanting to belong to both worlds and belonging to both. The homosexual also lives in a heterosexual world. She was most delighted to see by the results of the weekend's work that the overwhelming majority recognized they were human beings first and foremost, and as such, interested in claiming only those basic rights important to all.

One of the most pressing problems of the homosexual is that of not cutting himself off from society. "I deplore, I mourn, the loss to the total human community of the talents of the humans in it who set themselves apart," she declared.

She pointed out that the value of the three homophile organizations was that they did set themselves apart, thereby focusing on the problem. But to the total society this was not valid. "Society needs homosexuals as people, not as homosexuals."

In discussing the conclusions of the Scientific Theories' Drafting Committee (see page 14), Dr. Hooker said she was delighted with the beginning of the report and that she endorsed the stand unqualifiedly. It is imperative for scientists, she declared, that they can follow their own creative questions wherever they lead them. The problem with the report, she said, is that the proposals constitute a violation of the first statement.

FEAR IS REASON
FOR SO LITTLE RESEARCH

Why is there so little true research being done on the homosexual? she queried. The answer is that academic researchers are fearful of working in this area because they can't afford the risk of becoming labeled. Also there is fear on the part of the homosexual to become a subject of research.

Dr. Hooker pointed out that she is one of the few re-

searchers to start research work with the homosexual without assuming that homosexuality was a form of mental illness. But, she pointed out, she cannot know what her data will tell her when all the facts are compiled.

She agreed with the "need for impartial sex education of young people", but asked where do you get the people and when do you do it? There is a need for the opportunity for young people to discuss the problem, she stated. The problem is not to suppress information but to help the adolescent in the right way. "We know so little about sex in general, not only homosexuality," she said. The real problem is the utilization of what information we already have.

The Committee's statement about "the right to defense from faulty court testimony" brings up the question as to who is to judge what is faulty, she pointed out. As homosexuals can you not be biased? Dr. Hooker said she would like to see the word "faulty" stricken. She would like to see the statement made that "science should be given freedom by heterosexual society to investigate homosexuality without fear of consequences."

She concluded by asking the group to "trust science and scientists a little more than you do. Hope that what you are doing here may make scientists more able to work in the field, and recognize when you ask for unbiased help from heterosexuals that you too are biased."

DOB MAKES OFFICIAL STATEMENT

At the conclusion of Dr. Hooker's remarks Legg asked if any of the commentators wished to add anything. None did. However, Jaye Bell, national president of DOB, asked if she might speak. The following is the verbatim text of her remarks:

"This project was first presented to us via the mails in the form of a pamphlet entitled 'Bill of Rights'. After first reading and discussing it we said to ourselves, 'Why?' Either these are rights we already have, or they are rights which cannot be asked because to do so would be to demand that people have the attitudes we prescribe for them. One cannot demand or legislate attitudes.

"With the understanding that this project would be in accord with the majority present, we sent requests to our chapters for opinions on this 'Bill of Rights'. The concensus of almost all our members was the same: 'Why?' The only rights we want are those given to us as whole people under the United States Bill of Rights, not a bill that would represent only a small part of ourselves - a homosexual 'Bill of Rights'.

"The members then asked several of us to represent them at this Institute. This we came here to do. Unfortunately we now find that the program is not being run by a majority situation. This first became readily apparent during the luncheon, when almost everyone who stood up to speak said that his group was having a great deal of difficulty in functioning under the title 'Bill of Rights'. And even though the majority wanted the title reworded to something more workable, it was made quite clear that the title would stand. To find this true was quite a blow, to say the least.

"Originally we felt it to be an extremely presumptuous thing even for representatives of three homophile organizations to adopt a bill that, so titled, purports to be the wishes and thinking of all homosexuals. Then to find that even the representation of such a small minority of homosexuals as we have here has no voice either is to us beyond sanction.

"Not only are we here being asked to adopt a 'Bill of Rights' demanding attitudes from society (which, coming from any other group we would certainly laugh at as being for the most part impossible wants,) but we are also being asked to adopt a bill whose use or final wording we have no jurisdiction over. You are asking us to sign our reputation at the bottom of a blank contract.

"We realize there are questionnaires to be considered, but in the light of the difficulty of those here present in finding the same interpretation from questions asked we cannot help but doubt their validity.

"We sincerely hope that when we meet again there can be more of one-ness in goals. But for the present I must state that, in our position of representing 110 members

of the Daughters of Bilitis, only if this 'Bill' is changed to goals or aims can we approve.

"If it remains in the form of a 'Bill of Rights for Homosexuals' not only do we here officially dissociate ourselves from it, but we feel it to be potentially an extremely dangerous act to the work which has been done and is being done to change public opinion."

Following Miss Bell's speech Legg concluded that although the work of the Institute that weekend couldn't represent the DOB, it does represent the work of ONE in its Workshop sessions throughout the past year.

BLANCHE M. BAKER FOUNDATION

He then introduced William F. Baker, husband of the late Dr. Blanche M. Baker, who announced the formation of the Blanche M. Baker Memorial Foundation for work in the fields of research and education. Founding sponsors are Dr. Harry Benjamin, endocrinologist of New York; Baker, Don Slater, editor of ONE magazine, and Legg.

* * * * * *

SPECIAL NOTICES FROM DOB BOOK SERVICE

Enough advance orders have come in so that the DOB Book Service is now placing an order for the recording of the lyric poem by Pierre Louys, "Songs of Bilitis", under the title "Aphrodite". There are two different albums at $4.98 each, both of high artistic caliber and taste.

The 1961 Special Supplement to the 1960 Bradley-Damon Complete Cumulative Checklist of Variant, Lesbian and Homosexual Fiction will be available soon. Over 250 titles are listed and reviewed. As far as we know, this is the only listing of such literature to be published this year. A special department will deal with non-fiction and biography, and there will be a list of reliable second-hand book dealers. Price is $1.00.

Orders should be sent to DOB Book Service, 1232 Market St., Suite 108, San Francisco 2, Calif. Add 4% sales tax in California. Orders placed NOW will be honored without the usual handling charge.

Daughters of BILITIS

INCORPORATED

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS and San Francisco Chapter: 1232 Market St Suite 108, San Francisco 2, California

New York Chapter: 1133 Broadway, Room 304, New York 10, New York

Los Angeles Chapter: 527 Hazel Street, Glendale, California

MEMBERSHIP in the Daughters of Bilitis is limited to women 21 years of age or older. If in San Francisco, New York or Los Angeles area, direct inquiry to chapter concerned; otherwise write to National Office in San Francisco.

THE LADDER: a monthly publication by the DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC., mailed first class in a plain sealed envelope for $4.00 per year.

CONTRIBUTIONS are gratefully accepted from anyone who wishes to assist us in our work. We are a non-profit corporation working entirely on donated labor. Our fees are not of such amounts as to allow for much expansion of the publication. While men may not become members of the DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC., many have expressed interest in our efforts and our publication and have made contributions to further our work. Of course, anyone over 21 years of age may subscribe to THE LADDER.

DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC.
1232 Market Street, Suite 108,
San Francisco 2, California.

Please send THE LADDER for year(s) by first class mail sealed to the address below. I enclose $ at the rate of $4.00 for each year ordered.

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY _____ ZONE___ STATE_____

*I am over 21 years of age (Signed)*_____